DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 881 EA 020 513

TITLE	Report of the Paperwork Reduction Task Force.
INSTITUTION	Georgia State Dept of Education, Atlanta. Div. of Public Library Services.
PUB DATE	Aug 88
NOTE	42p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Information; Bureaucracy; *Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Networks; *Management Information Systems; *Noninstructional Responsibility; Recordkeeping; Relevance (Information Retrieval); *State Legislation; Surveys; Teacher Morale; *Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS	Georgia; *Paperwork Reduction; Quality Basic Education Act (Georgia)

ABSTRACT

This document comprises the recommendations of a 13-member Paperwork Reduction Task Force appointed by Georgia's State Superintendent of Schools, in response to concern by educators and the public that the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) had created a substantial increase in paperwork, particularly for teachers. The task force of teachers, principals, and local system administrators collected information from interviews with department of education program personnel; paperwork surveys; and data from school superintendents, educational organizations, and teachers. After an introduction, acknowledgements, and a review of background information, specific recommendations are presented for 25 issues related to provisions of the QBE. Specific recommendations include streamlining attendance reporting by eliminating the requirement to maintain state attendance registers and reducing from three to two the number of times full-time equivalency counts are taken during the school year. Several recommendations relate to the implementation of the statewide electronic information network (GENESIS) called for by QBE. Other recommendations relate to substituting criterion-referenced for norm-referenced student testing programs; reevaluating the remedial education program; reviewing the student support team concept; and standards documentation. Appended is the following documentation: membership of the task force, list of Department of Education presenters, paperwork survey of experienced teachers, list of meetings of the task force, and a compilation of paperwork required of teachers in one Georgia K-7 elementary school. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302881

Report of the

Paperwork Reduction Task Force

Submitted to

Werner Rogers
State Superintendent of Schools

by

Tucker Vaughn, Chairman
Superintendent
Columbia County Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

August 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Moughon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 513

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Acknowledgments	2
III.	Background	3
IV.	Recommendations	8
V.	Appendixes	19
	A. Membership of Paperwork Reduction Task Force	20
	B. Department of Education Presenters	22
	C. Paperwork Survey of Experienced Teachers	23
	D. Meetings of Paperwork Reduction Task Force	31
	E. Compilation of Paperwork Required of Teachers In One Georgia K-7 Elementary School	32

I. INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1987 Dr. Werner Rogers, State Superintendent of Schools, appointed a 13-member Paperwork Reduction Task Force. The task force included classroom teachers, curriculum directors, principals and superintendents. (Membership of the task force is shown in Appendix A.) Tucker Vaughn, Superintendent of Columbia County Schools, chaired the task force that was charged by Dr. Rogers "to find ways to reduce paperwork required of local school systems by the department." Particular emphasis was to be placed on identifying and reducing paperwork required of classroom teachers.

The task force met regularly from November 1987 through June 1988 in Atlanta. The task force received useful information from department staff and from nearly every segment of the public education community, including teachers, principals, superintendents, professional organizations and higher education.

The perception that the Quality Basic Education Act caused a substantial increase in paperwork required of local education agencies, particularly classroom teachers, prompted editorials in the media, paperwork surveys and studies by professional organizations and colleges of education, and meetings between legislators and educator groups. Given this broad base of concern about mounting paperwork, the task force believes its report should be given the widest possible dissemination. The task force urges the State Superintendent to distribute the report to the leadership of the entire education community.

The task force believes the recommendations contained herein and those already adopted and implemented by the department demonstrate that the superintendent and state board have taken and will continue to take effective action to mitigate the burden of paperwork requirements on local education agencies.

II. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Paperwork Reduction Task Force is deeply indebted to everyone who provided information, suggestions and counsel during the course of the task force's work.

It would be impossible to name all the individuals and groups who provided helpful insights to problems of paperwork relating to major education reform; instead, task force members wish to acknowledge the contributions of the hundreds of professional educators who spoke for thousands of teachers, counselors, principals, media specialists and superintendents across the state.

The Paperwork Reduction Task Force strived to distill from a huge amount of material those major issues that could and should be addressed at the state level. While there were numerous other paperwork issues brought to the attention of the task force, many of these issues require local solutions. This report centers on paperwork originated by and the responsibility of the department of education.

The task force also wishes to acknowledge and thank members of the department assigned to the project. Department staff members greatly facilitated the work of the task force, performing the important tasks of scheduling meetings, preparing material, arranging for presenters, conducting research and generally ensuring the task force progressed in a businesslike manner.

III. BACKGROUND

"We can lick gravity, but sometimes the paperwork is overwhelming."

Wernher Von Braun

After passage of the Quality Basic Education (QBE) Act, the Georgia Department of Education began a thorough examination of the QBE provisions to determine how much accountability the Legislature would require of the department and local school systems as the new and expanded programs were developed and implemented.

Although possibly not evident to local school systems, the department's intent to minimize paperwork was a strict guideline as department staff worked to translate QBE into policy, procedures and accountability. However, QBE contained many provisions that required information from local school systems that was not available in the department's files or computer data base. The department's need for new information in the form of reports, project proposals, grant applications, test results and standards documentation created the perception that QBE was a paper avalanche that was going to bury local school systems.

When complaints began to reach the state superintendent, he immediately acted by appointing the Paperwork Reduction Task Force (PRTF) to study the paperwork problem and to find ways to reduce paperwork. Following the PRTF organizational meeting on November 30, 1987, Chairman Vaughn wrote to local superintendents, leaders of education organizations and teacher groups to request specific examples of paperwork requirements imposed by QBE that were causing problems for local school system personnel. At the same time, key department of education program managers were scheduled to make presentations at subsequent meetings of the task force. Information obtained in this manner became the basis for the task force's work.

At its third meeting Chairman Vaughn reviewed the various issues identified as paperwork problem areas and divided them into categories. He appointed five task force subcommittees to investigate the issues and to make recommendations based on their findings. Members agreed that this was the best way to deal with the enormous amount of input the task force had received and adopted the subcommittee format for preliminary recommendations.

The following subcommittees were established.

1. FTE counts, attendance reporting, maximum class size
   Members: Ed Vosburgh, Octavia Milton, Don Thornhill

2. Lesson plans, student testing, remedial/compensatory education, student support teams
   Members: Patsy House, Carolyn Allen, Ray Pawlik

3. GENESIS, financial reporting
   Members: Dahl McDermitt, Jerry Jones, David Lariscy

4. Personnel/teacher evaluation
   Members: Roger Hatcher, Walter Judge, Tucker Vaughn

5. Standards documentation
   Members: Tom Bartley, Allen Gurley, Jack Fokes, Nancy Hall

Chairman Vaughn asked the subcommittee members to review the material the task force had received, to identify changes that are needed, to determine which law or policy supports the issue, and to make specific recommendations.

Each subcommittee reviewed material, met with department personnel and formed tentative recommendations that were discussed and considered by the full task force at its April 19 meeting.

At its next scheduled meeting on May 5, Chairman Vaughn called for additional presentations from DOE staff responsible for student testing, standards, remedial education and student support teams because input to the task force has pinpointed those issues as paperwork intensive. The presenters, who are listed in Appendix B, provided additional information and clarification of matters raised in the subcommittee meetings. Chairman Vaughn appointed a subcommittee to organize all subcommittee recommendations for review by the task force at its meeting on June 28.

It is noteworthy that the task force supported the department's legislative initiatives during the 1988 session to change antiquated laws that were causing additional paperwork for local school systems. For example, the requirement that schools take and report inventories quarterly to the central office was repealed. The task force also supported department efforts to fine tune the QBE law. These efforts were largely successful and resulted in several amendments to the QBE law that lessen paperwork requirements without diminishing the effectiveness of QBE.

In addition to the work of the task force, the state superintendent asked management-level members of the department to conduct an informal telephone survey of 540 classroom teachers concerning paperwork. (Complete survey results are included in Appendix C.)

Since a major focus of the PRTF was determining how much paperwork QBE had imposed on classroom teachers, it is extremely important to note that of the survey respondents, 67 percent stated that they currently have a problem with paperwork and that they were doing more paperwork in 1987-88 school year than they did in the the 1985-86 school year -- the last year of the Adequate Program of Education in Georgia. Reduced to its essentials, these respondents offered three solutions to the paperwork problems of teachers: (1) reduce, simplify or eliminate paperwork. If measurable progress cannot be made toward this goal, then (2) assist teachers to have more time to teach by hiring additional clerical help or give teachers more free periods, release time or work time to do paperwork or (3) pay teachers for the additional hours spent on their own time doing paperwork.

In another effort concurrent with this task force's work, Representative Bill Mangum, chairman of the House Education Committee, held a forum at the State Capitol during the 1988 legislative session where teachers were asked to discuss the increased paperwork demands on local classroom teachers.

On March 3, 1988, 12 teachers, invited by their local representatives, reported their concerns to the committee and other members of the House. Department of education personnel and representatives of professional educator organizations also heard these teachers express their concerns about increased paperwork that the teachers felt detracted significantly from their instructional time.

As a follow-up to the forum, staff members in the House of Representatives Research Office compiled a list of the paperwork issues identified by the teachers and grouped the issues into 19 specific areas of concern. Several other issues presented by the teachers during the course of the discussion were also listed.

From this listing the House Research Office developed a survey form and sent it to the teachers who had presented at the forum. The teachers were asked to code each issue as to whether it was a new or long standing problem and if they perceived the paperwork to be a requirement of the law (QBE), state standards or their local education agency. A copy of that report can be obtained from Dr. Jim Mullins, Executive Director, House Research Office, 458 Twin Towers East, Atlanta, Georgia 30334.

A major paperwork issue that surfaced immediately in the task force meetings was the perception at the local level that to comply with Standards, teachers were required to prepare detailed lesson plans containing specific reference to the Basic Curriculum Content (BCC). This issue was addressed by key department staff in several task force meetings and from these discussions came the clarification that detailed lesson plans were not, are not and will not be a requirement of Standards. On January 29, Dr. Rogers issued some changes in the application and reporting of Standards, as well as clarification of Standards verification measures. This memorandum clarified the means of verification for compliance with Standard I 3.2 Curriculum: Core Curriculum as follows.

> Lesson plans are <u>not</u> required in this indicator. Field administrators will review instructional planning materials and look for a relationship between those materials and the Basic Curriculum Content. These instructional planning materials might be a teacher's edition of a textbook with notes written inside, a curriculum guide with teacher notes, or a monthly/weekly calendar with notes. Specific references to the Basic Curriculum Content are not needed, nor is keying of the objectives or evaluation criteria.

In the February 18 edition of <u>The Link</u>, Dr. Rogers reaffirmed that detailed lesson plans are not required as a means of verification for Standard I 3.2.

The work of the task force highlighted another paperwork problem that department management acted immediately to correct. The Remedial Education Program caused an enormous paperwork burden on classroom teachers by requiring them to respond to a six-page monitoring questionaire, maintain a file on each remedial student and contribute to the completion of a nine-page remedial education plan.

Mary Murphy, recently appointed Remedial Education program manager, reviewed reporting and monitoring requirements and concluded that a significant reduction in paperwork could be achieved without adversely affecting administration or monitoring of the program nor impairing the desired educational outcomes. As a result of her efforts, the state's monitoring instrument has been reduced from six to two pages; classroom teachers are no longer required to keep a file on remedial students; and the state has reduced the number of pages of the remedial plan local systems must complete from nine pages to a single page. The task force commends Ms. Murphy for her fine work.

The task force recommends that the state superintendent encourage local school superintendents to initiate their own paperwork reduction effort to minimize the interruption of instructional time. This recommendation is based on information obtained during the task force's work that indicated a large amount of paperwork originates at the local level; furthermore, the instructional group that seemed to have a major portion of school paperwork was elementary school teachers. Appendix E is a listing of actual forms, reports, requests, records, documents, etc., that elementary teachers must cope with every day, while trying to find time to offer quality instruction.

In the following section the task force presents its recommendations with this caveat. QBE ushered in a new era for public education in Georgia. The QBE program was conceived by a governor who challenged the public education establishment to take a giant step forward while promising to put a full measure of the state's resources into education reform. The Education Review Commission appointed by the governor included outstanding education and lay leaders who devoted countless hours to research and deliberation so that each component of QBE rested on a bedrock of sound educational theory and everyday practicality. In presenting the QBE program to the General Assembly on January 16, 1985, the Governor said, "For too many years, we have let minimums or adequate be our standards. But after today, we will accept nothing less than quality as our standard and excellence as our goal."

The program, once formulated, was tempered in the crucible of legislative debate, out of which came a strengthened program that was unanimously passed into law. Then came implementation and the difficulty of translating legal code into policies and programs while maintaining a harmonious balance between accountability and progress. Initial implementation of QBE rigidly adhered to the letter of the law, which worked some hardship on all members of the public education establishment. The inevitable perception by educators was that QBE emphasized "top down" control and regulation, requiring teachers to complete routine clerical tasks of questionable value that deprived them of valuable teaching time. Teachers felt their efforts served a process -- not a purpose.

With the support of professional educator organizations, the department spearheaded an effort to lessen the documentation aspects of QBE by working with the General Assembly. Revised legislation in two sessions of the General Assembly has moderated the severity of some QBE requirements, particularly those monitored through Standards. The outcome is that the 1988-89 version of QBE is an educational program that calls for performance to be measured by reasonable, but not rigid, accountability. The state superintendent and his staff are to be commended for their pursuit of

paperwork reduction solutions; nevertheless, the task force finds that many QBE issues continue to create onerous amounts of paperwork for public school teachers and administrators.

The task force calls for adoption of its recommendations in the belief that accountability in the form of satisfactory documentation will not be sacrificed. The task force further believes that evidence of performance of public educators will be strengthened by restoration of mutual trust that should characterize relationships among professionals.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **ISSUE: Attendance Reporting**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-697 requires, "principals or local school site administrators and the teachers of public schools to report, in writing, to the visiting teacher or attendance officer of the school system reports of attendance in their school or classes as may be required by rule or regulation of the State Board of Education." The law further states, "All public schools shall keep daily records of attendance verified by the teachers certifying such records."

The QBE Act does not require any attendance reporting by the local school system except through the full-time equivalency (FTE) count process.

Recommendation: Eliminate the requirements of maintaining state attendance registers contingent upon local systems providing annual average daily attendance (ADA) data or equivalent information for state statistical purposes and federal reporting.

Rationale: Since ADA data no longer drives state funds for public education, the task force does not see any need for requiring teachers to keep the state attendance registers. ADA information needed for statistical and other purposes can be gathered by local systems through other simplified means or conversion of FTE counts to ADA.

2. **ISSUE: Full-time Equivalency Student Counts**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-160 states, "The State Board of Education shall designate the specific date upon which three counts of students enrolled in each instructional program authorized under the Article shall be made each school year. . . . The initial enrollment count shall be made prior to October 1, the second enrollment count after November 1 but prior to January 1, and the final enrollment count after March 1 but prior to May 1."

Recommendation: Continue the support of proposed legislation to reduce FTE counts from three to two per year.

Rationale: The task force believes that accurate and adequate data can be generated from two counts per year. The reduction from three to two counts would not only reduce the amount of paperwork at the school and local system level, but it would also increase the amount of time teachers and administrators can devote to the instructional program. The task force realizes that two counts are needed for accurate and realistic data for growing systems and midterm adjustments.

3. **ISSUE: Maximum Class Size Reporting**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-182(h) of the QBE Act states, "The State Board of Education shall adopt for each instructional program authorized...the maximum number of students which may be taught by a teacher in an instructional period."

Recommendation: The reporting of maximum class size should be eliminated. The monitoring of class size should be conducted during on-site visits by FTE field monitors.

Rationale: While the QBE Act requires the establishment of maximum class sizes, the monitoring of this requirement is left to the discretion of the State Board of Education. Presently local schools and school systems are required to file lengthy and complicated forms each semester to verify that the classes are within maximum class size range. The task force believes that the monitoring of maximum class size can be accomplished by the FTE monitors when they visit the school systems.

4. **ISSUE: GENESIS (Georgia Educational Network Exchanging School Information Statewide)**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-320 of the QBE law required that the implementation of a statewide comprehensive educational information network should be substantially completed by July 1, 1989, to include, at a minimum, complete FTE counts, the uniform budgeting and accounting system and complete salary data.

Recommendation: Restructure the GENESIS implementation schedule to give first priority to local units of administration (LUAs) that currently have no automated accounting capability. Following the implementation of GENESIS in those LUAs that are manually keeping records, the next priority should be those LUAs that contract for all or a portion (i.e., payroll only) of their record keeping.

Rationale: Superintendents of small- to medium-sized school systems have postponed acquiring computer equipment to perform accounting operations in the expectation that the GENESIS project would provide the needed equipment, software and training. The original GENESIS schedule has been revised and extended so many times that it is difficult to determine the rationale on which the original schedule was based. Moreover, it is even more difficult to learn the current official implementation schedule. The last known schedule was sent to school systems with H. F. Johnson's letter of June 15, 1987. However, the schedule was labeled "Tentative GENESIS Implementation Schedule." It is, therefore, not known if the GENESIS implementation schedule reflects this recommendation.

5. **ISSUE: GENESIS**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-320 of QBE.

Recommendation: Limit implementation of the GENESIS project to the financial accounting software until all LUAs have been converted.

Rationale: Based on comments received by the task force and information presented by DOE staff, it is evident that the GENESIS project is too ambitious for the resources allocated to it. The effort to implement the financial accounting software, FTE counts and the Certified Personnel Information System require more planning, time, personnel, expertise and funds than have been allocated to GENESIS. The task force believes that

the implementation of the financial accounting software is so crucial to the smooth and timely functioning of LUA operations that other software implementation should be delayed until the prescribed objective that gave birth to GENESIS in the original QBE legislation is achieved.

6. **ISSUE: GENESIS**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-240 of QBE

Recommendation: The state board should approve continuation of the use of IBM hardware and ESSI software in those systems currently operating a successful automated system. Furthermore, the Georgia Department of Education should make every effort possible in the implementation of GENESIS to accomodate those systems already computerized and reimburse these systems for cost comparable to systems receiving state selected hardware and software for GENESIS.

Rationale: More than 40 local education agencies were assured by the department that IBM hardware and ESSI software would be acceptable and compatible with state plans for implementation of GENESIS.

7. **ISSUE: Training LUA and DOE Personnel to Ensure Efficient Operation of GENESIS**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-320 of the QBE law directed the development, operation, training of appropriate personnel and maintenance of a statewide comprehensive educational information network.

Recommendation: Although the relationship of this recommendation to paperwork reduction seems tenuous, the sooner information moves by electronic means rather than by paper, the sooner LUAs will enjoy the full benefits of a "paperless" statewide data communication network. The department should give priority to the development and implementation of a training program to include LUA and DOE personnel to ensure efficient and accurate performance of GENESIS.

Rationale: Well-trained LUA fiscal personnel are essential to the continuing operation of GENESIS after installation. A successful conversion is only the first step in establishing a dependable computer system, and unless the department commits enough resources to enable LUA personnel to operate efficiently, secure timely and accurate resolutions to their problems, and receive reinforcement in the form of continuing training, the GENESIS project will falter and require LUAs to seek other means of managing their financial, instructional and instructional support operations.

8. **ISSUE: Lesson Plans**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-140 of the QBE law requires the State Board of Education to establish a uniformly sequenced core curriculum for grades kindergarten through 12. Local school systems must base their own curriculum on the state-adopted curriculum with an option to expand and enrich the curriculum as deemed necessary.

Recommendation: All state-adopted texts should have a correlation guide to the QCC or any state-adopted curriculum.

Rationale: The task force found that lesson plans are not a specific requirement of QBE or Standards. However, the task force recognizes the importance of lesson plans to the delivery of quality instruction, but also recognizes that requirements for preparation and maintenance of lesson plans are a local responsibility. The department can assist local school systems in meeting this responsibility by ensuring that all state-adopted textbooks contain a correlation guide to the Quality Core Curriculum (QCC).

9. ISSUE: Student Testing

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-281 of the QBE law requires testing of students in grades 2, 4, 7 and 9 through the use of nationally norm-referenced instruments.

Recommendation: The use of nationally standardized tests for Georgia students in grades 2, 4, 7 and 9 should be eliminated. Georgia Criterion-referenced Tests, presently administered in grades 1, 3, 6 and 8, and the Basic Skills Tests (high school exit examination in grade 10) should be continued with the following alterations: Items from nationally standardized tests should be embedded in the criterion-referenced tests so that statistical matrix sampling and analyses can be done to provide comparisons with the rest of nation. The criterion-referenced test administration at grade 6 should be given in grade 5. Local systems should be free to do norm-referenced testing according to their needs and at their discretion.

Rationale: A defined set of objectives have been designated by the department as those competencies sufficient for evidencing "basic skills." These objectives provide the backbone for the content of the Basic Curriculum Content and Quality Core Curriculum. Typically, tests that have been nationally standardized contain content from curriculum across the entire United States, content which may or may not be reflected in QCC or BCC. Testing students on content not covered is both punitive and useless. Since selection of textbooks by local school systems is governed by the state textbook list, assuming a system wishes to continue to receive QBE funding for those specific courses, content on a nationally standardized test may well come from textbooks not even on the state-approved list.

Testing students using the criterion-referenced tests (CRTs)based on Georgia curriculum is realistically the only valid and reliable method of assessing student progress and evaluating instructional programs within the state.

If the public wishes to compare the status of student achievement in Georgia with that of student achievement across the nation, the use of matrix sampling would achieve the same effect, but would not have the negative consequences of taking away valuable instructional time for the purposes of administering tests that provide very little diagnostic information and which, in fact, may "show" deficiencies that do not exist.

Serious consideration should be made to this recommendation in view of the recent controversy sparked by the report, "Nationally Normed Elementary Achievement Testing in America's Public School: How All Fifty States are Above the National Average," by J. J. Cannell (1987).

10. **ISSUE: Student Testing**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-281 of the QBE law directs the State Board of Education to administer criterion-referenced tests, or equivalent, in grades 1, 3, 6, 8 and 10.

Recommendation: Most public schools in Georgia have now moved to the middle school concept, middle school including grades 6, 7 and 8. The CRTs now given at the sixth grade should be administered at the fifth-grade level to provide diagnostic information for those youngsters who would be moving into the middle school. The sixth grade should be used as the single grade in which a nationally normed-referenced achievement test be administered statewide.

Rationale: On the educational continuum, the sixth grade is the natural breaking point between kindergarten and grade 12. Because the public continues to demand comparative data to determine a student's progress compared with other youngsters across the nation, the administration of one single norm-referenced test at grade 6 would provide a middle-of-the-educational-process evaluation and would satisfy the desires of the public who seek to evaluate Georgia's educational system as compared to systems nationally. The transfer of the CRT to grade 5 would provide diagnostic information for teachers at the middle school. Continuing the CRT administration at the eighth grade provides diagnostic information for those youngsters entering high school.

11. **ISSUE: Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Model**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-151 of the QBE law requires that the State Board of Education administer a criterion-referenced test to all children entering the first grade within the 60 days immediately prior to September 1.

Recommendation: The task force recommends that the present Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Model be revised so as to eliminate any norm-referenced test as a determining factor in first-grade eligibility.

Rationale: The present readiness assessment model may require as many as two additional tests for kindergarten students whose score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) is not congruent with the teacher recommendation concerning first-grade eligibility. This also entails additional documentation, student support team meetings and, in the case of arbitration, meetings with parents to support placement. This procedure requires testing throughout the summer months as well as during the first half of the next school term. The combination of all these factors places an undue amount of paperwork on kindergarten teachers and school administrators.

The task force feels that teacher recommendation should be the first and foremost factor in the decision-making process for moving a child from one grade to another. A normed test should be only one of many indicators of the capabilities of the student. A skills checklist based on the Quality Core Curriculum objectives should provide a complete picture of the child's level of achievement in kindergarten and serve as a predictor of success

for the first grade. This checklist should be developed statewide and mastery should be monitored, accumulated and tabulated throughout the school year--not just at the end of the school term. This skills checklist should also be the basis of requirements for students entering the first grade from other states or private schools.

12. **ISSUE: Remedial Education**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-154 of the QBE law directs the State Board of Education to implement a remedial education program for underachieving students in grades 2 through 5 and grade nine. Students in grades 10 through 12 who fail portions of the state's basic skills test are also eligible.

Recommendation: As indicated earlier in this report, the Remedial Education program manager has already made significant reduction in paperwork requirements; however, the department should reevaluate the program to determine some way to eliminate pre- and post-testing in order to reduce time, money and paperwork involved. If test data is deemed essential to the proper referral of remedial students, then the department should provide that such test data be obtained from the state's regular testing program through coordination with the Assessment Division of the state department of education.

Rationale: Students eligible for the remedial education program should be provided maximum time-on-task in a learning environment that allows for more individual instruction. Local system testing is required at every level for either pre- or post-test information. This additional testing, which decreases instructional time to less than students would receive in a regular setting, is inconsistent with the concept for remedial education program.

The cost for pre- and post-testing is high and reduces local funds that could be used to benefit all instructional areas.

13. **ISSUE: Student Support Teams**

Legal Basis: The QBE law does not contain a provision covering student support teams. The department of education, in response to a court order arising out of the Marshall case (1984), agreed to employ the student support team method in the state's public general education programs.

Recommendation: The department should reevaluate its implementation of the student support team concept with particular emphasis on its legal obligation to apply student support teams to special education or general education.

Rationale: The task force understands the concept of student support teams in the instructional process, but implementation at the local level has been inconsistent and confusing. In addition, the process has become a paperwork nightmare for both teachers and administrators.

The student support team concept has been used for several years now and its applicability to special education or general education is still obscured.

14. **ISSUE: Standards Documentation**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-240 of QBE

Recommendation: Schedule meetings between local education agencies (LEAs) and field administrators to help LEAs in interpretation of required documentation for the standards. These meetings may be regional and involve the area regional director.

Rationale: In order to eliminate duplication of documentation required for standards and to clear lines of communication between Georgia Department of Education officials and local education agencies, it is important that both agencies have an understanding of all requirements for QBE standards documentation.

15. **ISSUE: Appointment of Standards Advisory Committee**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-240 of QBE

Recommendation: Appoint an advisory committee selected by representative groups to react to standards, standard documentation and interpretation before implementation. Representative groups should include superintendents, classroom teachers, principals and curriculum and support personnel.

Rationale: Responsibility for implementation of education programs in Georgia is delegated to local educational agencies; therefore, said agencies should be represented in Georgia Department of Education meetings where decisions are made concerning implementation of Standards.

16. **ISSUE: Role Clarification Among State Agencies Relating to Standards Compliance**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-240 of QBE

Recommendation: Clarify which agency is responsible for each standard. Example: Human Resources should assume responsibility for immunization. eye, ear and dental examination.

Rationale: School personnel are not certified to perform certain task required by state Standards.

17. **ISSUE: Duplication of Monitoring**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-240 of QBE

Recommendation: The department should accept monitoring reports from their own staff members who have already evaluated a school system, for example, staff development, remedial education, special education, FTE count, school bus inspection and audits.

Rationale: Each office in the department of education should work cooperatively in administration and implementation of Standards.

18. **ISSUE: Data Collected by Georgia Department of Education**

Legal Basis: N/A

Recommendation: The state department of education should supply each LEA with a list of all pertinent information concerning Standards that is currently on file in the department and will not be required by the LEA for Standards documentation. The list should be sent to the LEA in ample time before the Standards visit to eliminate duplication of paperwork.

Rationale: Many local education agencies provided documentation for Standards which was already on file with the state department of education.

19. **ISSUE: State Board Policies**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-240 of QBE

Recommendation: State board policies should be written in a form whereby each local system may adopt the policy without changes if they so desire. The current process requires a rewrite with the end result the same.

Rationale: Many local education agencies do not have the staff members required to modify state board policies for local use.

20. **ISSUE: Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP)**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-210 of the QBE law directs that all personnel employed by local units of administration must have their performance evaluated annually by trained evaluators.

Recommendation: The results of the GTEP statewide field test should be used to streamline the paperwork and reporting requirements to a minimum.

Recommendation: Eliminate beginning (assessable) teachers from the GTEP while they are required to participate in the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI), at least during the first-year.

Recommendation: The required professional development plan should be simple and provide defined, restrictive parameters that prohibit additional student testing or paperwork that does not directly impact student achievement.

Rationale: Evaluation is essential to self-improvement and accountability. The teacher is the key to the success of the day-to-day delivery of instruction. In order to provide the best educational opportunities for Georgia students, teachers must be competent and work to improve their performances. Evaluation must be conducted in an open, nonthreatening manner if self-improvement efforts are to be successful.

ISSUE: Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI)

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-210 of the QBE law directs that all personnel employed by local units of administration shall have their performance evaluated annually by trained evaluators.

Recommendation: The GLEI process should be evaluated at the end of the first year of implementation, and changes should be made in the requirements which will streamline the quantity of paperwork.

Recommendation: Eliminate first year administrators from the GLEI while they are required to participate in the Leadership Performance Assessment Instrument (LPAI).

Recommendation: The required documentation necessary to verify that all job performance expectations have been met should be clearly defined at a minimum level; likewise, any self-improvement activities on a professional development plan should be defined within parameters that prohibit additional student testing and unnecessary paperwork.

Rationale: The leadership role encompasses a diverse and complex set of skills and competencies. As a result, the leadership evaluation instrument must be generic and flexible in nature to allow for a vast array of job assignments. Local systems should be able to individualize the administrative job performance evaluation to meet local needs and expectations.

22. **ISSUE: Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI)**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-210 of the QBE law directs that all personnel employed by local units of administration shall have their performance evaluated annually by trained evaluators.

Recommendation: The portfolio requirements should be clearly defined to avoid the production of paperwork unnecessary to meet all competency requirements.

Recommendation: Simplify the portfolio labeling and documentation requirements where careless errors made by an assessable teacher require that a second complete portfolio be developed on a different unit.

Recommendation: Exempt fully certified, experienced teachers from other states from the initial TPAI assessment requirements in Georgia whenever the teacher completed a state assessment program as required for full certification in the other state.

Rationale: It is essential that teachers demonstrate competence in order to earn a certificate to teach in the education system in Georgia. The community has the right to demand competent, well-qualified teachers and school systems are accountable for evaluating their performance and taking steps to ensure that teachers are competent educators.

23. **ISSUE: Leadership Performance Assessment Instrument (LPAI)**

Legal Basis: Section 20-2-210 of the QBE law directs that all personnel employed by local units of administration shall have their performance evaluated annually by trained evaluators.

Recommendation: Extending the one-year time line for completing all portions of the LPAI over a three-year period to allow one third of the required paperwork to be completed each year.

Recommendation: Exempt fully certified, experienced administrators from other states from the initial LPAI assessment requirements whenever the administrator completed a leadership assessment program in another state.

Rationale: Administrators must possess a diverse range of skills and experiences in order to be effective in a leadership role. In light of the renewed demand for educational accountability and research which substantiates the direct relationship between the competence of the instructional leader and the level of student achievement, Georgia must ensure that leadership personnel have the essential skills to perform competently.

24. **Issue: Unnecessary Paperwork Required of Local Education Agencies by DOE**

Legal Basis: Although there are no specific legal requirements or state board policies that mandate the reduction of paperwork, the state superintendent of schools, the state board, the legislature and the Governor have expressed emphatically their support of classroom teachers having maximum time to spend on instruction and not on paperwork. All of these groups have issued strong statements that every effort should be made at the local as well as state levels to reduce and eliminate paperwork.

Recommendation: The state superintendent of schools should require each associate state superintendent to submit to him a report on each unit's efforts to reduce paperwork required in every program area including specific examples of where paperwork has been reduced or eliminated. If efforts to reduce paperwork were unsuccessful, the reports should state specific reasons for the manager's inability to make changes or improvements (i.e., federal requirement). These reports should be documented, compiled into a master document and distributed statewide to local system superintendents, members of this task force, legislators and professional education organizations.

Rationale: During the course of our meetings with DOE personnel, task force members expressed to the program administrators the frustrations of local system personnel and stressed the need to reduce the paperwork required of local systems by the department. In some cases the suggestions and encouragement of the task force resulted in these staff members returning to their program areas, reviewing their paperwork requirements and instituting changes and streamlining requirements, as in the case of the remedial education program. The task force believes this activity would be a valuable exercise for each unit in the department.

25. **ISSUE: Paperwork Created At The Local Level**

Legal Basis: Like the previous recommendation, there are no specific legal requirements or state board policies that mandate reduction of paperwork at the local level.

Recommendation: The state superintendent should strongly encourage all local superintendents to conduct a close review and evaluation of paperwork requirements within their systems with particular emphasis on local paperwork requirements imposed on classroom teachers.

Rationale: The task force dealt only with paperwork that is originated and controlled by the department; however, much of the information and material the task force received in response to its requests for examples of unnecessary paperwork were found to be the result of local requirements--not state or federal. It is evident that local school systems need to conduct a thorough review and evaluation of its paperwork requirements to find ways to lessen the paperwork burden on administrators and teachers.

APPENDIXES

MEMBERSHIP OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION TASK FORCE

Tucker Vaughn
Superintendent
Columbia County Schools
P.O. Box 10
Appling, GA. 30802
404/541-0650

Jack L. Fokes, Sr.
Superintendent
Macon County Schools
P.O. Box 488
Oglethorpe, GA 31068
912/472-8188

Jerry Jones
Superintendent
Wayne County Schools
555 South Sunset Boulevard
Jesup, GA 31545
912/427-4244

Dahl McDermitt
Superintendent
Coffee County Schools
617 East Ward Street, Box 959
Douglas, GA 31533
912/384-2086

Patsy House
Teacher
Central Middle School
Telfair County Schools
McRae, GA 31055
912/868-6029

Octavia Milton
Director of Special Education
Atlanta City Schools
210 Pryor Street, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30335
404/827-8655

Carolyn Allen
Director of Elementary Education
Gordon County Schools
P.O. Box 127
Calhoun, Ga. 30701
404/629-7366

Roger Hatcher
Principal
Hardaway High School
Muscogee County Schools
2901 College Drive
Columbus, GA 31906
404/327-6527

Tom Bartley
Principal
Westwood Elementary School
Dalton Public Schools
708 Trammell Street
Dalton, GA 30720
404/278-2809

Allan Gurley
Associate Superintendent
White County Schools
P.O. Box 295
Cleveland, Ga. 30528
404/865-2315

Walter W. Judge
Associate Superintendent
Dougherty County Schools
P. O. Box 1470
Albany, Ga. 31703
912/431-1286

Raymond Pawlik
Teacher
Southside High School
Atlanta City Schools
81 Glenwood Avenue, S.E.
Atlanta, GA 30312
404/624-2064

Ed Vosburgh
Vocational Supervisor
Cartersville High School
320 East Church Street
Cartersville, Ga. 30120
404/382-3200

MEMBERSHIP OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION TASK FORCE

CONTINUED

Don Thornhill
Director
Facilities and Transportation
Division
Ga. Dept. of Education
1670 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334-5050
404/656-2440

Nancy G. Hall
Asst. Director, Public Information
and Publications
Ga. Dept. of Education
2052 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334-5050
404/656-2476

David A. Lariscy
Director, Fiscal Services
Ga. Dept. of Education
1566 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334-5050

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PRESENTERS

PRESENTER	TITLE	TOPIC
Stan Bernknopf	Director, Student Assessment and Test Development	Student Assessment
Ray Bouchillon	Coordinator, Local Strategic Planning	Local Strategic Planning
Elizabeth Creech	Coordinator, Student Assessment and Test Development	Student Assessment
Curtis Dixon	Director, General Instruction Division	Quality Core Curriculum/Student Support Teams
Bill Gambill	Associate Superintendent, Office of Department Management	Lesson Plans/ Standards/GENESIS
Mary Murphy	Coordinator, Remedial Education	Remedial Education Program
Jim Puckett	Director, Georgia Education Leadership	Leadership Academy
Werner Rogers	Superintendent of Schools	Task Force Charge
Jane Shah	Director, Standards and Evaluation Division	Standards
Lucy Welzant	Coordinator, Research, Reporting and Development	Standards
Mary Lillian White	Coordinator, Gifted	Special Education Due Process/Monitoring
Gary Wolovick	Legal Assistant	Legal Basis for Student Support Teams
Ellouise Collins	Director, Compensatory Education	Compensatory Education
Other		
Joe McCall	Joseph McCall & Co., Inc. (contractor with Department of Education)	GENESIS

PAPERWORK SURVEY OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS
March 1988

A telephone survey of experienced teachers was conducted by the Georgia Department of Education during the latter half of March 1988. Its purpose was to determine the extent to which teachers believe they are required to do more paperwork than before QBE, whether they feel burdened by it, and who they feel is responsible for requiring it. It also gathered information on teachers' specific paperwork complaints and their suggested remedies.

The sample was chosen by selecting every third school listed in the Georgia Public Education 1988 Directory. Telephone contacts were made to each school during school hours, mainly by state department personnel, including the state superintendent's administrative staff, associate state superintendents, assistant superintendents, division directors and regional directors. The person answering the phone was requested to find an experienced teacher, who was not in the classroom at the time of the call, to speak with the caller.

Five hundred thirty-nine calls were made. Of these attempts, 487 interviews were conducted with experienced teachers.

CONTACTS ATTEMPTED

	N
On Spring Break	16
Declined to Participate	15
Did Not Return Call	5
Beginning Teacher or Person Changed Job Last Two Years	16
Experienced Teachers	487
Total Attempted	539

The 487 experienced teachers who responded were sorted according to their answers to the first three questions, in order to identify those who (a) have problems with paperwork, (b) feel that the paperwork required of them is different from two years ago, and (c) cite specific problems. This resulted in a final group of 327 respondents whose characteristics and responses matched the purpose of the survey.

Question 1 was: Do you personally have a problem with paperwork?
Question 2 was: Are you completing any paperwork this year that you did not complete two years ago?
Question 3 was: What is the specific paperwork you did not complete two years ago ?

Some teachers (7) replied that they are not having a problem--and although the paperwork they are required to do is different from that of two years ago (prior to QBE implementation), they cite no specific problems. Others (52) said that they are having a problem, but that it is no different from two years ago. A complete analysis of perceived problems follows.

PERCEIVED PROBLEMS

Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Number
Yes	Yes	Yes*	327
Yes	Yes	No	0
Yes	No	Yes*	30
Yes	No	No	22
No	Yes	Yes*	44
No	Yes	No	7
No	No	Yes*	3
No	No	No	50
Uninterpretable			4
		Total	487

* Listed specific paperwork problems

Although 21 percent of teachers initially said they have no paperwork problems, about half went on to cite specific problems they are experiencing. Thus, only 10 percent reported no problems at all. Sixty-seven percent (327 teachers) answered yes to the first two questions and, in addition, cited specific problems. Since this group is of greatest interest for the purposes of the survey and is of sufficient size to yield reliable results, the responses of these 327 teachers are reported in the remainder of the report.

Experienced teachers feel they have paperwork problems in the following areas.

TYPES OF PAPERWORK PROBLEMS

	Percent
Lesson Plan Requirements	52%
Attendance/Enrollment Reporting	50%
Remedial/Compensatory/Special Ed.	44%
Student Testing/Evaluation	37%
State Standards	24%
Student Records	15%
Other Instruction-Related Paperwork	9%
Inventories	7%
Personnel Development	6%
Collecting/Accounting for Money	6%
Miscellaneous Other	22%
"No Particular Thing, It Just Adds Up"	12%

(Percents do not add to 100 because most teachers report more than one source of their problems.)

A more detailed break-out of these categories better illustrates the particular problems teachers are experiencing.

DETAIL OF PAPERWORK PROBLEM TYPES

	N	Percent
Lesson Plans	171	52%
Unnecessarily Detailed Plans Required	(110)	(34%)
Correlating Lesson Plan Objectives with BCC, QCC, CRT, Guides, etc.	(50)	(15%)
Lesson Plans/State Standards	(6)	(2%)
Duplication of Lesson Plans for Media Center Visits	(5)	(2%)
Attendance/Enrollment	164	50%
FTE	(81)	(25%)
Attendance Registers	(36)	(11%)
Maximum Class Size	(7)	(2%)
Out-of-Class Activity (Non-Instructional Time Policy)	(17)	(5%)
Other Attendance[1]	(23)	(7%)
Remedial/Comp. Ed./Special Ed.	145	44%
Remedial/Compensatory Ed.	(47)	(14%)
Student Support Teams	(29)	(9%)
Special Education	(69)	(21%)
Student Evaluation	120	37%
Testing	(38)	(12%)
Grading Papers	(14)	(4%)
Other[1]	(68)	(21%)
Standards Documentation	77	24%
General	(71)	(22%)
Lesson Plans/Standards	(6)	(2%)
Student Records	49	15%
General	(30)	(9%)
Health	(2)	(1%)
Requests for Student Info.	(5)	(2%)
Discipline	(12)	(4%)
Other Instructional	29	9%
Homework (not grading)	(3)	(1%)
Textbook Adoption	(3)	(1%)
Curriculum Revision	(11)	(3%)
Lab Records	(8)	(2%)
Other	(4)	(1%)

[1]Permission to leave school; tardy reports; notification to central office of students out more than five days; field trip forms, etc.

Inventories[2]	22	7%
Personnel Development	20	6%
Teacher Evaluation	(13)	(4%)
Other Personnel Evaluation	(2)	(1%)
Inservice Education	(7)	(2%)
Collecting/Accounting for Money[3]	21	6%
Miscellaneous	71	22%
Parent-Teacher Contacts	(12)	(4%)
Student Scheduling	(12)	(4%)
Surveys	(11)	(3%)
Assurances	(12)	(4%)
Southern Assoc. Accreditation	(12)	(4%)
Permission Slips	(1)	(0%)
Fairs/Contests	(2)	(1%)
Middle School Planning	(5)	(2%)
Advisement System	(3)	(1%)
Federal Impact Aid	(1)	(0%)
"No Particular Thing, It Just Adds Up"	40	12%

[2]Textbooks; number of pieces of paper used; equipment; rooms occupied.

[3]Lunch; school pictures; yearbook; charity drives; graduation fees, etc.

Question 4 was: Who do you think is responsible for requiring each of these paperwork items? Since respondents did not always associate a particular source with a particular problem, results can only be reported overall. Again, percents do not add to 100 because teachers mention more than one source of their paperwork problems.

PERCEIVED SOURCES OF PAPERWORK PROBLEMS

	N	Percent
State Department of Education	185	57%
(including State Standards)	(29)	(9%)
QBE (Governor, Legislature)	137	42%
Local System	67	20%
Federal	15	5%
Special Education	8	2%
School (Principal)	6	2%
Public	6	2%
Self	5	2%
SACS	4	1%
Don't Know/Not Sure	23	7%

The primary source reported is the State Department of Education, which is named by more than half of the respondents. It is interesting to note, however, that 23 teachers (7%) are not sure who is responsible for their problems.

SUGGESTIONS

Questions 5 and 6 asked how to reduce or eliminate the paperwork load. Teachers' suggestions fall into two large categories. The first relates to simplification, reduction, or elimination of current requirements. The second relates to helping teachers cope with current requirements.

Since 45 respondents complained about paperwork requirements being redundant or duplicative, many suggestions relate to avoiding duplication through simplification, coordination, or elimination.

SIMPLIFY

Lesson plan requirements (45). Teachers particularly object to having to write detailed lesson plans and to relate lesson objectives explicitly to various sets of test or curriculum objectives which apparently have different coding systems. Nineteen teachers mention having to correlate lesson plans with the BCC or QCC. Teachers don't see the need to re-write the objectives in the teacher's manual. Several complain about having to write the same objectives over again for the media specialist when a visit to the media center is planned.

Special education/compensatory education reporting (18). In addition to the IEP, there are special education records for referral, classroom evaluation, requests for assistance, and documentation of instruction. Similarly, teachers feel oppressed by the amount of documentation required for Chapter I, the Remedial Education Program, and the Student Support Team process. They see a wasteful amount of redundancy in these processes and in the required forms.

Other desired simplifications are: attendance records (4), state standards (1), discipline forms (1), testing records (1), health records (1), TPAI process (1), "all forms" (1).

REDUCE

Frequency of reporting (10). The primary item mentioned is the number of FTE counts, with specific suggestions to drop the December count.

Amount of testing (6).

Class size (16). (Smaller classes generate less paperwork.)

The number of things that have to be documented (9).

Evaluation of experienced teachers (3).

Other nonteaching duties, e.g., bus duty, playground duty, lunchroom duty (3).

Other reductions desired are standards documentation (2) and the frequency of form changes (1).

ELIMINATE

The item mentioned most often is attendance registers (14), followed closely by FTE (9). "Senseless paperwork" (6) and lesson plans (5) are also cited, followed by one or two votes each to eliminate the media center request form, the uninterrupted time-on-task record, the non-instructional time record, lesson plan verification, the field trip form, inventory forms, the school lunch count, the classroom inventory, the CRT, the mandated curriculum, QBE, school-level standards, standards, Chapter I pull-out programs, all nonteaching duties, all nonteaching-related forms, teacher evaluation, beginning teacher evaluation, administrator evaluation, peer evaluation, the vocation MIS, and the six-class requirement for all students.

The second major category of suggestions have to do with how to help teachers cope with the paperwork they now have. These are analyzed in the following table.

HELPING TEACHERS COPE WITH PAPERWORK

	N	Percent
Have Someone Else Do It	143	43%
Clerical Staff	(64)	
Paraprofessionals/Aides	(60)	(39%)
Counselor Aides	(2)	
"Someone Besides Teachers"	(5)	
System-Level Staff	(3)	
Special Ed. Staff	(3)	
Parent Volunteers	(1)	
Lead Teachers	(1)	
Subject Area Specialists	(1)	
Counselors	(1)	
In-School Suspension Staff	(1)	
Special Team of Homeroom Teachers	(1)	
Eliminate Duplication	46	14%
Give Teachers Additional Time/Money	40	12%
Planning Time	(27)	
Work Days/Release Time	(12)	
Additional Pay	(1)	
Use More Computer/EDP Technology[4]	40	12%

[4]Specific suggestions are to use computers for report cards, scheduling, attendance registers, grading, FTE, instructional management, standards records, lunchroom records, test results.

Give Teachers More Professional Trust and Don't Require So Much Documentation	16	5%
Involve Local Systems/Teachers in Data Collection Decisions	15	5%
Improve Teachers' Understanding of Forms and How to Do Them	15	5%
Standardize/Stabilize Forms	12	4%
Improve Time Factors	5	2%
Require No Paperwork of Teachers That Is Unrelated to Teaching	5	2%

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The theme running through these responses is teachers' frustration at having to neglect their teaching responsibilities because of increased paperwork requirements, and their underlying sense that it is distrust which forces them to have to document so many transactions. They seem to be particularly upset about paperwork that is unnecessary or redundant, such as detailed lesson plans that make them rewrite objectives and activities from the teacher's manual. Many teachers also have to correlate their lesson objectives with a number of other sets of objectives, such as those in curriculum guides, or the CRT, or the Basic Core Curriculum. This is especially time-consuming when the various sets of objectives are different and are coded dissimilarly. Teachers are understandably impatient with paperwork for which they see no purpose. They feel that the paperwork essential to good teaching is burdensome enough, without having to complete forms no one ever sees or uses. They feel they are required to do things that serve only to prove that some action has been taken or some fact verified.

Teachers believe the state (DOE, state standards, QBE, the legislature) is the main source of increased paperwork requirements. Their suggestions for alleviating the problem fall into two categories: (a) reduce, simplify, or eliminate paperwork and (b) assist teachers to cope with current requirements.

Assist teachers to cope with current requirements. If paperwork continues to be so burdensome that teachers feel they don't have time to teach, hire additional clerical help, provide teachers with free periods/release time/work days (to do paperwork), or pay them for the additional hours they have to spend doing it.

Provide some in-service on the purposes of the forms and how to do them. Show how to do them more quickly and efficiently. Teachers say they would feel more cooperative if they understood the forms' purposes.

Get good data processing equipment and software into every school as quickly as possible and teach teachers how to use it.

Assure that every school has a good photocopy machine and see that it is kept in working order. Some schools apparently still rely on ditto machines.

Simplify the forms. Use a checklist format as much as possible. Use the same form for more than one purpose, e.g., special ed., comp. ed., REP, SST forms. One correspondent is designing a lesson plan form that is largely a checklist. Another showed how IEPs could be made partially into checklists.

Don't change the forms so often. Teachers say that just when they get used to a form, it is changed. Standardize the forms. Some suggest that the state design all forms used in more than one system, e.g., special services referrals, so that when teachers change systems they don't have to learn a new set of forms. Generally, teachers are aggravated by what they see as constant changes in forms or other state-imposed requirements--when they think a job has been done, e.g., revising curriculum guides, it has to be done over. They also wish the state would be very clear and explicit as to what is acceptable.

Coordinate DOE requirements so as to reduce or eliminate duplication of the same information in different formats.

MEETINGS OF THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION TASK FORCE

DATE	LOCATION
11/30/87	Atlanta
01/07/88	Atlanta (Cancelled due to weather)
01/26/88	Atlanta
02/15/88	Atlanta
04/19/88	Atlanta
05/05/88	Atlanta
06/28/88	Atlanta

In addition to the meetings of the full task force, the various subcommittees met several times with department staff and others to prepare their recommendations.

COMPILATION OF PAPERWORK REQUIRED

OF TEACHERS IN ONE GEORGIA K-7 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

This compilation lists the actual paperwork for which elementary teachers in one school are responsible. Teachers are usually required to complete the paperwork themselves, either partially or wholly. In a few cases, teachers must insure that someone else, such as a parent, completes it, or teachers must update it, or see that it is on file and accessible.

The list does not include the paperwork teachers do in producing instructional materials or tests, or the paperwork involved in checking students' work, nor does it include any "optional" paperwork initiated by teachers, such as special communications with parents.

KINDERGARTEN

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Transfer student identification information
Immunization forms (new students)
Eye, ear, dental screening forms (new students)
Rolodex card for each student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Individual teacher schedule for week
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Purchase orders
Printing requests
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Lice record
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Property inventory
Kindergarten progress report, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report for each special ed. student
Individual class schedule for each special education student
Daily lesson plans (by the week)
Individual progress folder, reading, by objective, by student

FIRST GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Transfer student identification information
Immunization forms (new students)
Eye, ear, dental screening forms (new students)
Rolodex card for each student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Individual teacher schedule for week
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Purchase orders
Printing requests
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Lice record
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Property inventory
Textbook inventory
Immunization checklist
Report cards, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report for each special ed. student
Individual class schedule for each special education student
Daily lesson plans (by the week) - reading (each group), math, language arts, p.e.)
Individual student progress folder, reading, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Behavior monitoring checklist, by student
Class profile sheet, by student - Writing to Read program
Class record form - periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Class record chart - attainment of math objectives, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student

SECOND GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Transfer student identification information
Immunization forms (new students)
Eye, ear, dental screening forms (new students)
Rolodex card for each student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Individual teacher schedule for week
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Purchase orders
Printing requests
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Lice record
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Property inventory
Textbook inventory
Immunization checklist
Report cards, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report for each special ed. student
Individual class schedule for each special education student
Daily lesson plans (by the week), by subject, by group within subject, if any
Individual progress folder, reading, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Behavior monitoring checklist, by student
Class profile sheet, by student - Writing to Read program
Class record form - periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Class record chart - attainment of math objectives, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student
Parental permission for student's participation in remedial program
Student support team documentation: individual student referral form, information checklist, several behavior checklists, speech/hearing/language checklist, screening checklist of seven areas of learning, alternative strategies, parent permission for screening, reports to parents of screening results, conference report of SST.
Class roster
Summary of test results, by quartile, for 17 reading skills, 14 math skills

THIRD GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Transfer student identification information
Immunization forms (new students)
Eye, ear, dental screening forms (new students)
Rolodex card for each student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Individual teacher schedule for week
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Purchase orders
Printing requests
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Lice record
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Property inventory
Textbook inventory
Report cards, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report for each special ed. student
Individual class schedule for each special education student
Daily lesson plans (by the week), by subject, by group within subject, if any
Individual progress folder, reading, by objective, by student
Individual record form, periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Record and assignment chart, math, by student
Class record chart - attainment of math objectives, by student
Family report of student progress, math, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student
Student support team documentation: individual student referral form, information checklist, several behavior checklists, speech/hearing/language checklist, screening checklist of seven areas of learning, alternative strategies, parent permission for screening, reports to parents of screening results, conference report of SST.
Parental permission for student's participation in remedial program
Parental notification of student non-selection for remedial program
Class roster, one for regular class, one for each REP class
Alternative school report, by student

FOURTH GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Transfer student identification information
Immunization forms (new students)
Eye, ear, dental screening forms (new students)
Rolodex card for each student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Individual teacher schedule for week
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Purchase orders
Printing requests
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Lice record
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Property inventory
Textbook inventory
Report cards, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report for each special ed. student
Individual class schedule for each special education student
Daily lesson plans (by the week), by subject, by group within subject, if any
Individual progress folder, reading, by objective, by student
Individual record form, periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Record and assignment chart, math, by student
Class record chart - attainment of math objectives, by student
Family report of student progress, math, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student
Student support team documentation: individual student referral form, information checklist, several behavior checklists, speech/hearing/language checklist, screening checklist of seven areas of learning, alternative strategies, parent permission for screening, reports to parents of screening results, conference report of SST.
Parental permission for student's participation in remedial program
Parental notification of student non-selection for remedial program
Class roster, one for regular class, one for each REP class
Alternative school report, by student
Behavior reports, by objective, by student, by week, for special ed. students
Behavior rating scale, special ed. students
Behavior evaluation scale, special ed. students
Alternative methods attempted, special ed. students

FIFTH GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Transfer student identification information
Immunization forms (new students)
Eye, ear, dental screening forms (new students)
Rolodex card for each student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Individual teacher schedule for week
Daily lunchroom report
Lunch charge ticket
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Purchase orders
Printing requests
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Deposit slip
Lice record
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Property inventory
Textbook inventory
Report cards, by student
Referral to special education (Before You Refer a Child)
Adaptation of classroom instruction report for each special ed. student
Individual class schedule for each special education student
Behavior monitoring checklists, by objective, by week, by special ed. student
Behavior Evaluation Scale, by special ed. student
Daily lesson plans (by the week), by subject, by group within subject, if any
Individual progress folder, reading, by objective, by student
Individual record form, periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Record and assignment chart, math, by student
Class record chart - attainment of math objectives, by student
Family report of student progress, math, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student
Student support team documentation: individual student referral form, information checklist, several behavior checklists, speech/hearing/language checklist, screening checklist of seven areas of learning, alternative strategies, parent permission for screening, reports to parents of screening results, conference report of SST.
Parental notification of student assignment to remedial program
Class roster, one for regular class, one for each REP class
Alternative school report, by student
Student insurance documents
Referral to gifted program
Homework assignment sheet for in-school suspension or sick student
Referral for attendance/social worker

SIXTH GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Rolodex card for each homeroom student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Deposit slip
Summary accounting of money received from students
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Individual teacher staff development plan
Property inventory
Textbook inventory, by class
Grades and absences submitted for computerized report cards, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report, by special ed. student
Daily lesson plans (by the week), by period
Individual record form, periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student
Student support team documentation: individual student referral form, information checklist, several behavior checklists, speech/hearing/language checklist, screening checklist of seven areas of learning, alternative strategies, parent permission for screening, reports to parents of screening results, conference report of SST.
Class roster, by class
Alternative school report, by student
Homework assignment sheet, by class period, by student
Deficiency reports to parents
List of high honor and honor students
Chapter I student selection
Parent permission for student to receive migrant program services
Report to principal of students who received an F in the first semester
Parent permission for student to take part in science fair
Daily schedule, by period, by student
Report of classes in which teacher does not have a special ed. student
Report of number of students scoring in each quartile on vocabulary and reading tests
Weekly Super Star student report
Daily absentee report
Early dismissal permission slip
Class permit slip
Sign-out sheet for students excused to leave class
Daily attendance report to office, by class, by student

SEVENTH GRADE

Each student's permanent record
Enrollment card for each new student
Rolodex card for each homeroom student
Daily attendance register (incl. monthly and yearly statistical summary)
Student withdrawal form
School accident report
Parents request for medication at school
Individual student log of medication administered
Application for free and reduced price school meals
Daily lunchroom report
Application for extracurricular bus trip
Class size report (standards data collection report)
School-sponsored non-instructional time, by student
Request for approval of special leave
Receipts for any money received from individual students, such as for school pictures
Deposit slip
Summary accounting of money received from students
Appraisal of teacher competency and/or documentation related to beginning teacher performance assessment
Individual teacher staff development plan
Property inventory
Textbook inventory, by class
Grades and absences submitted for computerized report cards, by student
Adaptation of classroom instruction report, by special ed. student
Daily lesson plans (by the week), by period
Individual record form, periodic reading tests, by objective, by student
Math record chart, by objective, by student
Basic skills objectives report, by objective, by student
Grade books, by subject, by student
Student support team documentation: individual student referral form, information checklist, several behavior checklists, speech/hearing/language checklist, screening checklist of seven areas of learning, alternative strategies, parent permission for screening, reports to parents of screening results, conference report of SST.
Class roster, by class
Alternative school report, by student
Homework assignment sheet, by class period, by student
Deficiency reports to parents
List of high honor and honor students
Chapter I student selection
Parent permission for student to receive migrant program services
Report to principal of students who received an F in the first semester
Parent permission for student to take part in science fair
Daily schedule, by period, by student
Report of classes in which teacher does not have a special ed. student
Weekly Super Star student report
Absentee report
Early dismissal permission slip
Class permit slip
Sign-out sheet for students excused to leave class
Daily attendance report to office, by class, by student
Assignment sheet for make-up work
Response to principal's request for information to share with parent
Library permit
In-school suspension assignment sheet, by student